DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 706 HE 033 705

TITLE Academic Planning and Program Review. Academic Information Series 1. Revised.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ. System, Madison.
PUB DATE 1995-11-10
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Planning; *Guidelines; Higher Education; *Program Development; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *University of Wisconsin System

ABSTRACT

This document, replacing a 1992 edition, offers administrative guidelines to assist in the implementation of Regent policy on academic planning and program review in the University of Wisconsin (UW) System. These guidelines provide information on the UW System: (1) planning in academic programs and academic support programs; (2) planning and review principles; (3) joint UW System administration/institutional planning and review; (4) institutional review processes; (5) reporting procedures; and (6) formats needed for submission of reports to UW System administration. Appendices contain examples of the type of information that may be included in preliminary planning, program development, and joint review. The document also includes a glossary of terms. (EV)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 449 706

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

Academic Information Series 1. revised
(ACIS-1. revised)

# ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PROGRAM REVIEW

November 10, 1995

This document has been prepared as administrative guidelines to assist in the implementation of Regent Policy on Academic Planning and Program Review in the UW System. These guidelines provide information on UW System Planning in Academic Programs and Academic Support Programs; Planning and Review Principles; Joint UW System Administration/Institutional Planning and Review; Institutional Review Processes; Reporting Procedures; and the formats needed for submission of reports to UW System Administration.

This document replaces ACIS-1 dated August 1984,
ACIS-1.1 dated October 1987, and ACIS-1. revised dated September 1992

Other related documents:
- ACIS-4 January 1977
- ACPS-1 February 1975
- SG9 B

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

smilhem



HE033705



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University of Wisconsin System
Academic Planning and Program Review

TABLE OF CONTENTS


Introduction ..... 1

Academic Program Reporting Overview ..... 2

Section I: Planning and Review Principles ..... 3
Cost Control Policies ..... 4

Section II: Planning in Academic Programs and Academic Support Programs ..... 6
Overall Context for Planning ..... 6
Mission Statements ..... 6
Basic Policy Papers ..... 6
Other Systemwide Policy Documents ..... 6
Institutional Statements of New Academic Priorities ..... 6

Section III: Joint UW System Administration/Institutional Planning and Review ..... 7
New Program Planning and Approval ..... 7
Lateral Program Review ..... 9
Systemwide Program Studies ..... 9

Section IV: Institutional Review Processes ..... 10
Purposes and Requirements for Institutional Program Review ..... 10
Types of Institutional Review ..... 10
Institutional Review of General Education Programs ..... 10
Cyclic Review of Existing Academic and Academic Support Programs ..... 11
External Accreditation ..... 12

Section V: Reporting Procedures ..... 13
Reporting the Results of Institutional Planning ..... 13
Comprehensive Institutional Planning ..... 13
Joint and Institutional Planning for New Programs ..... 13
Reporting the Results of Institutional Program Review ..... 13

Appendix ..... 14
A: Preliminary Entitlement to Plan a Proposal for a New Academic Program ..... 14
B: Proposal for authorization to Implement a New Academic Program ..... 15
C: Letter of Transmittal Requesting Authorization to Implement a New Academic Program ..... 21
D: Joint Review for Final Approval of a Newly Implemented Academic Program ..... 22
E: Joint Review For a Newly Implemented Academic Program ..... 23
F: Establishment or Substantial Modification of a Submajor or Certification Program ..... 25
G: Institutional Report on General Education Programs ..... 26

Glossary ..... 28

**University of Wisconsin System Academic Planning and Program Review**
[APPR]

## Introduction

The Board of Regents' Working Groups on Undergraduate Education, meeting in Summer 1991, identified the need to modify UW System's academic program review policies. In response to that need, this document, Academic Planning and Program Review (ACIS-1. revised), was adopted by the board as Policy in September 1992, as part of the System President's December 1991 Report, The Undergraduate Imperative: Building on Excellence. ACIS-1. revised replaced all existing UW System academic program review documents. The document emphasizes systemwide lateral reviews, includes general education in required joint System Administration-institutional program reviews, and supplies details for the development and review of new programs. It also sets systemwide parameters for joint and institutional planning and review, and presents board expectations for accountability. In addition, it emphasizes some new elements of program review, such as use of both academic and professional external consultants, and incorporates the November 1990 recommendations of the Board of Regents' Supplies and Expense Task Force and calls for the inclusion of supplies and expense data in planning and review. This policy applies to all UW System undergraduate and graduate academic programs and academic support programs.

In 1995, a joint UW System/Vice Chancellor working group was charged to examine the processes involved in program authorization and the current division of authority for program entitlements. As a result of this body's deliberations, the program review process (Section III) was substantially revised and those revisions incorporated into the current document. In particular, responsibility for developing new programs is shifted from system to the institutional level, with the System Administration responsible for maintaining the quality and overall balance of systemwide program array.

"University of Wisconsin System Academic Planning and Program Review" [APPR] furnishes a complete reference for the department chair, vice chancellor, or others beginning a planning or review process. ACIS-1. revised October 6, 1995 replaces ACIS-1. revised September 1, 1992. This document and its appendices supersedes the following documents: ACPS-1: "University of Wisconsin System Planning Principles;" ACPS-1.1: "Policy Paper on Entitlements to Plan;" ACIS-1: "University of Wisconsin System Academic Program & Planning Guidelines;" ACIS-4: "Summary of University of Wisconsin System Academic Program Audit and Review;" and SG9 B: "Protocol for Joint Review of General Education Programs."

Academic Program Reporting Overview*

This table describes the timetable for the various actions that require approval or reporting. Institutions are expected to consult with each other and with UW System Administration at appropriate points in the process of developing and implementing all new programs. Section III (Joint UW System Administration/Institutional Planning and Review) describes this procedure in detail.

| Action | Timetable for System Admin Action | Timetable for Regent Action | System Admin Action | Board of Regent Action | Format for Request for Action |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Establish or Alter the Institutional Mission | Anytime | Anytime | Y | Y | No special format |
| Establish, Rename or Eliminate a College/School/Division** | Anytime | Anytime | Y | Y | No special format |
| Establish, Rename or eliminate a Department | Anytime | | I | I | No special format |
| Establish, Rename or eliminate a Center or Institute*** | Anytime | | I | I | No special format |
| Decision Points for Program Development (new major/degree) (see 1-4, below) | | | | | |
| #1: Preliminary Entitlement | September 1 | | Y | I | Statement of Intent to Plan |
| #2: Authorization to Implement | Anytime | Anytime (after two reviews) | Y | Y | Executive Summary Requesting Authorization |
| #3: Implementation | | | I | | |
| #4 Joint Review | | | Y | I | |
| Degree Program Extended to a Second Institution | Anytime | | Y | I | No special format |
| Results of Institutional Program Review | October 1 | | I | I | No special format |
| Substantive Redirection of Major/Degree | Anytime | Anytime | Y | I | No special format |
| Eliminate a Degree/Major/Submajor | Anytime | | I | I | No special format |
| Renaming Major/Degree/Submajor | Anytime | | I | I | No special format |
| Establishing Submajor or Certification Program | Anytime | | I | I | Letter of Information |
| General Education Program Reporting Schedule | As scheduled every 5-7 years | As scheduled every 5-7 years | Y | I | General Education Format |

Y = Formal Action Required
I = Information Only
* = See Glossary for Definition of Terms
** = Section 36.09 (1)(gm) applies to creation of some schools or colleges
*** = Only when state funds are involved initially or as a commitment for continuing the center or institute
NOTE: All submissions should be directed to the UW System Office of Academic Affairs. All I items will be reported to the Board of Regents on request.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Section I: Planning and Review Principles
### Including "UW System Cost Control Policies"

Over the years, the UW Board of Regents has developed these planning and review principles designed to enable institutions to maintain high quality academic programs through efficient and effective use of available resources. UW System Administration is responsible for planning and oversight of the systemwide program array.

1. Each institution has responsibility for efficiently and effectively using available resources to develop and maintain the high quality academic programs that will enable it to carry out its mission.

2. UW System Administration has responsibility for coordinating the program initiatives of the institutions in order to assure that initiatives are consistent with all mission statements and that they are consistent with the efficient and effective use of the resources of the UW System as a whole.

3. Board policy states that future program development in the UW System will rely heavily on base budget reallocation and/or resource redevelopment at the institutional level; and that, therefore, new program proposals which become part of the UW System's planning will be closely linked with, and often dependent on, existing program reviews and stated planning priorities of all the institutions.

4. UW System Administration and the institutions must use the review of existing programs to identify and plan toward the modification, elimination, or consolidation of low demand, inefficient, obsolete, and unnecessarily duplicative programs during consideration of possible reallocation of finances and/or personnel.

5. Whenever possible, the UW System will implement general interinstitutional planning and programming within regional consortia. The board encourages the development of consortia as one basis for increased cooperation not only among UW institutions, but also among private colleges and universities, and WTCS institutions.

6. The board will continue to designate institutional, interinstitutional, regional, or state bases for coordinated planning and/or implementation of UW System-sponsored programs, such as the Great Lakes Research Facility.

7. All decisions concerning program development or elimination in the UW System will be made through systemwide planning and with reference to the following general academic priorities:

    a. High quality teaching and scholarship in the basic arts, humanities, and sciences associated with higher learning should provide the basic common context from which or within which all programs in the UW System should flow. For this reason, UW System Administration will place high priority on planning, implementing, and/or maintaining appropriate capability for excellent undergraduate teaching programs in general or liberal studies at each of the institutions.

    b. Beyond undergraduate liberal studies offered throughout the UW System, a diverse array of undergraduate and post-baccalaureate programs should also be present.

    c. Plans regarding the range and diversity of professional and liberal arts and sciences programs at any institution must be developed according to the priorities established in the relevant mission statements.

    d. While mission and program differentiation are high priorities of the UW System, the range of professional and liberal studies programs offered by the institutions should overlap only when program duplication is clearly necessary to meet the highest priority concern: to provide the highest quality, most cost-effective university system possible for the citizens of Wisconsin.

8. Programming within the UW System must also be planned with reference to the following additional priorities for the efficient and effective use of resources:

   a. UW System Administration and the institutions must place high priority on increasing access to educational opportunity in Wisconsin only where it is both essential and achievable in balancing high quality with cost effectiveness.

   b. UW System Administration and the institutions will continue to avoid unnecessary duplication of educational opportunity and will eliminate unnecessary duplication where it exists.

   c. UW System Administration and the institutions will consider nationally available educational opportunities as they develop priorities concerning newly identified, unfilled educational needs in Wisconsin. If Wisconsin's educational needs can be effectively and more economically served by consortium or compact relationships with institutions in other states, that avenue should have the highest priority.

9. Use of mutually-agreed-upon external consultants (academic and/or professional) is required for all new undergraduate and post-baccalaureate academic programs.

10. All program planning or review must take into consideration the following "UW System Cost Control Policies:"

    a. The board affirms that UW System Administration and the institutions have responsibility for maintaining and enhancing educational quality. They also have responsibility for holding costs to the minimum level consistent with quality standards. Since the cost of higher education is an increasing impediment to maintaining and expanding educational opportunity, the UW System will give priority attention to this responsibility in all planning and review efforts.

    b. Factors other than price inflation and compensation increases generate increased costs for some courses, course sequences, and programs. These factors include the costs of materials and equipment and the costs associated with necessary or desirable changes of teaching methods. Therefore, overall costs can be controlled only by eliminating low priority efforts or by reducing unit costs for some courses, sequences, and programs below present levels. In its planning efforts the UW System will emphasize methods for achieving savings which will then be used to support efforts to maintain or enhance quality in other courses, sequences, and programs.

    c. Another major objective of all planning and review efforts is the development of procedures to ensure cost savings through:

       - The elimination or consolidation of low enrollment courses.
       - The elimination or consolidation of administrative, academic, or academic support units too small to efficiently use resources.
       - The elimination, reduction or regionalization of low priority programs.
       - The control of course proliferation, including requirements in the major and/or in credits required for the degree.
       - The appropriate elimination of specific courses, academic programs and/or academic support services no longer relevant to students' needs or to the state of Wisconsin.
       - The reexamination of instructional practices, especially in high cost-per-credit areas, and the conduction of research into the development and implementation of appropriate, alternative practices which both maintain quality and reduce costs.
       - The development of appropriate workload policies.

- The provision of accurate and timely information to potential students regarding requirements for admission into and completion of major programs of study, to facilitate efficient and effective use of credits-to-degree by individual students.

d. During review of existing programs and/or planning of new programs, institutions must consider or reconsider the academic and fiscal implications of specialized accreditation.

e. Every institutional report of program review and/or document in support of new program planning must contain substantive discussion of allocation and/or reallocation decisions necessary for maintaining and/or supporting the program under discussion, using the appropriate standard format.

## Section II: UW System Planning in Academic Programs and Academic Support Programs

### Overall Context for Planning

**Mission statements.** In addition to the overall UW System mission statement, the Board of Regents approves select mission statements for each institution. Within the framework of mission statements, the board delegates responsibilities to the institutions and UW System Administration respectively. Institutional program planning cannot deviate from nor expand upon an institutional mission statement without board approval.

**Basic policy papers.** Implicit in the board's balanced delegation of responsibility is the need for comprehensive academic planning. In previous actions, the board adopted the "Planning and Review Principles" [Section I] that outline general policy concerning the efficient and effective use of available resources and academic planning and program review, including specific criteria, priorities, and procedures for planning and program review decisions. These "Principles", including "UW System Cost Control Policies" [Section I, item 10 and following], are to be considered during academic planning and review activities.

**Other systemwide policy documents.** During the 1980's the UW System completed two systemwide planning efforts, Planning the Future (1986) and The Issues of the Nineties (1990). During the 1980's and early 1990's, the UW System also completed several systemwide studies of professional disciplines (business, engineering, teacher education, and agriculture and natural resources) and two systemwide studies of academic support areas (libraries and student affairs). The 1990-91 Board of Regents' activities in connection with the improvement of undergraduate education, including the board's Working Groups and UW System Administration's response, The Undergraduate Imperative: Building on Excellence, also constitute a systemwide comprehensive plan. These documents have identified policies concerning the continuation, modification, elimination, or consolidation of existing programs, and for the review of new programs.

### Institutional Statements of New Academic Priorities

Efficient and effective systemwide planning is dependent on responsible institutional efforts. Therefore, each UW System institution must develop and implement planning efforts through methods chosen by and suitable to the institution.

Institutional planning must be consistent with the UW System's overall planning principles (see Section III), as well as with appropriate mission statements. The paramount goal of institutional planning is the development of stated priorities for any new institutional undertakings. Institutional planning principles should specify criteria and procedures for planning and program review. UW System Administration must be provided with a clear statement of institutional priorities (see Section V). Institutions will have the opportunity to review and revise their plans on a "rolling horizon" schedule to allow for modification of plans as circumstances change.

Each institutional plan must state in some detail its new programmatic intentions for at least a five-year period, together with a more general description of such intentions for the next five-year period. Intentions both in the continuation, modification, elimination, or consolidation of existing programs, and concerning new academic programs must be included in this plan.

UW System Administration will maintain and annually update a list of approved entitlements to plan. Any program that is not implemented within five (5) years of having received implementation approval will be removed from the entitlement list.

Proposed interinstitutional or cooperative programs should be included in planning statements.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Section III: Joint UW System Administration/Institutional Planning and Review

UW System Administration and the institutions must plan and/or conduct joint reviews in a number of areas, including new program planning and approval and lateral program review.

### NEW PROGRAM PLANNING AND APPROVAL

Board policy calls for joint planning of new programs, with formal board approval at stipulated decision points, to ensure such planning meets systemwide "Planning and Review Principles" [See Section I].

Formal activity in the joint new program planning process begins when an institution requests an entitlement to plan a proposal for a new academic program leading to a degree. [References to mandatory reporting procedures and protocols are in section V.] The program development and authorization process for new majors and degree programs occurs in the following seven steps:

**Step 1:** Institution determines the feasibility of its intent to plan new program. If planning is deemed feasible, then the institution proceeds to step 2. Informal consultation with other institutions is encouraged when appropriate.

**Step 2:** Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs notifies UWSA Senior Vice President for **Academic Affairs of intention to proceed. Information provided to UW** System in **the form of a memorandum shall include the following:**

A. A brief statement identifying the program and addressing the following issues (extensive documentation not required):

1. Relation to institutional mission, strategic plan, goals and objectives;
2. Projected source of resources (reallocation, external funds, request for new dollars);
3. Student need;
4. Relation to other programs in UW System and region.

B. Consultation with other institutions

1. UWSA Office of Academic Affairs circulates intent to plan to VCs of all institutions for comment. Institutions are expected to provide comment within 30 days.
2. Institutions' comments forwarded to UW System Administration, initiating institution, and the vice chancellors of all other institutions.
3. If necessary, UW System Office of Academic Affairs consults with institutions to ascertain how program fits into systemwide program array and whether revisions need to be made to the proposal.

**Step 3: Institution(s)/UWSA Consultation**

A. System Office of Academic Affairs and VC for Academic Affairs discuss the intent to plan document.

B. Consultation results in (a) inclusion of program in the Entitlement to Plan list, (b) return of proposal to institution for additional work or (c) rejection of intent to plan.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. Impasse in agreement between institution and UWSA can be forwarded to Chancellor and President for resolution.

D. System Office of Academic Affairs regularly updates Entitlement to Plan list and maintains on computer network; file made available on request.

**Step 4: Program Development**

A. Submission of a proposed program to UWSA for authorization by the Board of Regents must undergo a process that includes the elements listed below. Choice of the sequence of these elements is left to the institution.

1. Review of the proposal by consultants external to the proposing unit. Consultants shall be from outside the proposing institution(s).

2. Review of the proposal by appropriate governance bodies.

3. Review of the proposal by a three-person Program Review Committee consisting of a representative of the program proposing unit, a representative of the campus VC for Academic Affairs and a representative of the Senior VP from the UW System Office of Academic Affairs.

B. The report of the Program Review committee, along with an Executive Summary, is submitted jointly to the campus VC for Academic Affairs and the UW System Senior VP for Academic Affairs. If the Program Review Committee recommends against implementation, the VC for Academic Affairs and Senior VP for Academic Affairs consult on next steps. If the Program Review Committee recommends implementation, the program proposal is prepared for action by the UW System Senior VP for Academic Affairs.

C. If the System Senior VP for Academic Affairs recommends approval, the program is submitted to the Board of Regents with appropriate supporting documentation.

D. The Board of Regents acts on authorization to implement the program.

**Step 5: Implementation is left to the campus(es). At the time of implementation, the campus notifies the Senior VP for Academic Affairs.**

**Step 6: Joint Program Review**

A. The Program Review committee (Step 4.A.3) will serve as part of a Joint Review Committee to administer the first joint program review approximately five years after initiation of a new program. If the original members of this committee are unavailable, replacements will be named by the respective appointing officers.

B. The Joint Review Committee will make recommendations to the VC for Academic Affairs including the possibility of program elimination, transformation, continuation, etc.

C. The VC for Academic Affairs consults with System Office of Academic Affairs prior to accepting the recommendations of the Joint Review Committee.

D. System Senior VP for Academic Affairs acts on program.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Step 7: Programs reviewed for the first time will be reported along with other program reviews.**

**Lateral Program Review**

In the UW System, a lateral program review is an intensive and comprehensive examination of similar academic programs at several or all institutions. The fundamental purpose of such a review is to determine whether or not state resources are being used effectively and efficiently to meet the educational needs of the state of Wisconsin. Consistent with the Planning and Review Principles (Section I), the lateral program review process seeks to balance high quality with cost effectiveness. This includes increasing coordination and cooperation among institutions in a manner compatible with enhancing educational quality while ensuring the effective use of resources across the UW System as a whole.

The first step in a lateral program review should be the enumeration of specific expectations set jointly by the Board of Regents, System Administration, and chancellors. As the parameters for the review are set, particular attention should be paid to systemwide program capacity, access, and quality, institutional program quality and costs, unnecessary program duplication, and supply and demand for majors in, and graduates of, professional degree programs. A time frame and estimate of costs should be set and adhered to for the lateral program review, and lines of responsibility for the process and the outcomes should be clearly delineated.

The second step in a lateral program review is the comprehensive joint study which should include a self -study by each involved institution assessing the quality and costs of its program. The joint study team -- composed of UW System Administration Staff, representatives from the chancellors or provosts/vice chancellors, representatives from the program under study, faculty and external consultants chosen jointly by System Administration and the chancellors -- is charged with assessing the quality and cost effectiveness of the individual institutional programs as they relate to the UW System's overall effective and efficient use of resources for the particular program being studied. The team should consult with institutional faculty, and keep the Board of Regents abreast of its activities.

The third step is the opportunity for the chancellor or provost/vice chancellor at each institution to respond to the report of the joint study team.

The fourth step is the creation of recommendations by a group consisting of UW System Administration, representatives from the chancellors' or provosts'/vice chancellors' offices, and deans or department chairs from the program under study. Recommendations should address the issues enumerated at the outset of the review. Recommendations should be framed in a way that serve broad system and state goals of quality, cost effectiveness, and access but that can be implemented by institutional and inter-institutional action. The Board of Regents should be consulted during this process.

The fifth step is discussion and approval by the Board of Regents.

**SYSTEMWIDE PROGRAM STUDIES**

Special studies of selected programs or program areas are done to determine state and UW System needs. Comprehensive studies of this type, perhaps involving other state and private institutions, systems, or agencies, are aimed at strengthening an existing academic program or academic support program offered at several or all UW institutions. In some cases these studies may lead to a lateral program review. During the 1980's, UW System did statewide program studies in several undergraduate professional degree programs in conjunction with systemwide strategic planning. The guidelines for implementation of those studies were integrated into board policy and are considered as additional principles for planning and review.

## Section IV: Institutional Review Processes

### Purposes and Requirements for Institutional Program Review

Given the need for a rational, systematic, and concerted effort to use resources wisely, the UW System Administration bases its consideration of the systemwide academic program array on the review of academic programs conducted at the institutional level. Review results are reported to UW System Administration and are available to the board [see Section V]. Regular institutional review of existing programs will:

- improve the quality of undergraduate and/or graduate instructional programs;
- identify needs for additional study or planning;
- help to set priorities for allocation/reallocation of resources within or among departments and colleges, and to ensure overall institutional financial equilibrium;
- ensure UW System standards for program quality;
- identify the needs and unique circumstances of certain programs;
- identify nonfunctional or unnecessarily duplicative programs;
- identify needs for structural changes in programs or administrative units.

UW System Administration's involvement in the review of existing programs is to: (a) define broad guidelines; (b) verify that institutional processes, procedures, and results meet guidelines and board policies; (c) receive and evaluate institutional reports to ensure compliance with board policies and principles, such as those described in Section II of this document, and/or board planning documents; and (d) when requested, report on results of the evaluation to the board. UW System Administration's involvement can also include requirements for formal institutional reporting or site visitations by UW System Administration staff.

Although formats and protocols for institutional reviews are designed at the institutional level, reports on institutional program review shall include substantive discussion of specific details of responsible program administration, including credits-to-degree, estimates of graduates' average completed semesters, course sequencing and course availability, and specific discussion of credit and/or course requirements added or deleted. Reports must include consideration of the Board of Regents' recommendations on Supplies and Expenses. All program planning and review must address points included in "Planning and Review Principles" and "UW System Cost Control Policies" [see Section I].

### Types of Institutional Review

#### Institutional Review of General Education Programs

In 1986, the board confirmed "the importance of a strong general education core appropriate to the academic programs at every institution in the UW System" and directed "the faculty at each institution to review regularly their general education requirements and the adequacy of the courses offered to meet those requirements and to report to UW System Administration and the board that such reviews have taken place at regular intervals." To respond to this resolution, UW System Administration and academic vice chancellors from each institution developed a ten-year review cycle and a suggested protocol for the study of general education to be used as a guideline by institutional governance bodies.

However, the Board of Regents' Working Group on Undergraduate Academic Programs (1991) asked for improvements in the review and reporting procedures regarding general education. Therefore, the 1991 board charged each institution to:

- Improve the focus upon and the level of specificity in the report to UW System Administration concerning review results, including any significant changes planned.

- Document the institutional philosophy of general education, including explanations for institutional and/or college-level requirements; reasons for relative emphases on skills and on content; and discussion of integration and coherence between and among general education requirements and the major. Include explanations of how the curriculum provides students with opportunities to complete coursework appropriate to the institutional philosophy as stated. Discuss institutional assessment and the general education program.

- Discuss general education requirements and the total credits required for all undergraduate degrees.

Beginning in 1992-93, UW System institutions must expand review of institutional and/or college-level general education programs and initiate more substantive reporting to UW System Administration. UW System Administration will evaluate review results within a seven-year cycle or less and aid the institutions in preparing detailed institutional presentations to the board. UW System Administration and the reporting institution will agree upon a presentation to the board, (see appendix, section G, for suggested topics).

**Cyclic Review of Existing Academic and Academic Support Programs**

Each institution is responsible for comprehensive and intensive reexamination of all academic programs and all academic support programs. The review should lead to recommendations that a program be: a) expanded or augmented with additional resources, b) continued in its present form and at its current resource level, c) changed in form or direction, d) strengthened and reviewed earlier than the regular review cycle, e) consolidated with other programs, or f) phased out. All reviews must be based on the principles contained in this document and its appendices, as well as other relevant board policies. The results will be evaluated by UW System Administration and must be available for reporting to the board.

Unless otherwise stipulated by board policy as in the case of general education review, each institution shall place all programs on a regular review schedule, to be shared with UW System Administration. This schedule may be modified to reflect such factors as: (a) anticipated retirement or departure of key faculty members; (b) a regularly scheduled site visit by an accreditation team; and (c) recommendations from systemwide or institutional committees or task forces. The review process should be essentially the same for all programs.

In general, a cyclic review of an academic program by the institution should parallel the review that is required for the final authorization of new programs and should give consideration to the items considered in a joint review of academic programs (see appendix, sections D and E for suggestions). The institutional review has the following objectives:

- Determine whether the program is meeting its goals and objectives. Also assess how well the program contributes to meeting specific state or societal needs.
- Examine the relationship of the program to other academic programs of the institution and the institution's mission. This includes considering the priority of the program within the institution and the effect of the program on other programs of the institution.
- Assess the level of quality attained by the program. This may include an examination of the quality of the instructional staff, enrollments, the curriculum, academic support services and external evaluations. Where appropriate, comparisons with similar programs at other institutions in the UW System or elsewhere are encouraged.
- Evaluate whether a cost effective, quality program can be sustained. This may include an evaluation of current and projected costs of the program compared to similar programs, incremental demands on educational resources, and the benefits of the program to the institution, region and state.

Academic program review begins with an evaluation and self-study at the department or program level by the faculty/staff who are specifically concerned with program implementation. The self-study report should contain an evaluation of the curricula, and it should list obsolete and unnecessary courses that have been deleted and courses that have been added or revised. It should review program requirements and the sequence of courses. The self-study should include discussions of enrollments, job placements, student retention and changes in the discipline. Improvements in instruction and professional development or upgrading of faculty/staff may also be discussed.

Institutional representatives responsible for program planning and review should refer to UW-Extension program review processes when relevant. UW-Extension program review calls for coordination of institutional processes with assessment of extension programming at the department, unit, or county level.

Each institution's academic vice chancellor is responsible for all reviews of existing academic programs and academic support programs. That office is also responsible for all subsequent reporting to UW System Administration.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**External Accreditation**

As a means of attesting that educational quality has met standards external to the institution, UW System institutions and some individual academic programs voluntarily seek evaluation by an accreditation agency or professional association. Accreditation can be a means of assuring the educational community, general public, and other agencies or organizations that the accredited institution or program has clearly defined appropriate educational objectives, has established conditions suitable to their achievement, appears to be accomplishing them, and can be expected to continue. These reports can also provide additional information to UW System Administration and the board. The UW System has formalized the relationship of UW System Administration and the board in these procedures in General Administrative Policy Paper #24.

To be most efficient, institutions should coordinate institutional review with external review processes. UW System Administration will facilitate that coordination, as evidenced by the 1991 board recommendation on joint NCATE/DPI review of participating institutions' teacher education programs.

Board policy requires that accreditation of specialized programs be reconsidered during regular institutional program review. While for many programs, particularly professional degree programs, accreditation is desirable, no institution or academic program should renew or initiate accreditation procedures without serious consideration of both fiscal and academic consequences. Each institution's academic vice chancellor is responsible for reporting the results of accreditation reviews as well as other decisions concerning accreditation, to UW System Administration.

## Section V: Reporting Procedures

### Reporting the Results of Institutional Planning

**Comprehensive Institutional Planning.** The institutions must inform UW System Administration about processes for and results of comprehensive institutional planning. Such plans should form a context for new program requests and will be required before consideration of new programs. They should also provide a basis for other institutional decisions. Reference to comprehensive institutional plans should be made, as appropriate, for discussions before the Board of Regents.

**Joint and Institutional Planning for New Programs.** Institutions should submit new program requests for entitlements to plan and authorization to implement new programs as stated on the schedule entitled, "Academic Program Reporting Overview." UW System Administration summarizes its actions on these requests and provides informational reports to the board upon request. The institutions must report on institutional program planning and make requests for new programs using the procedures for new program approval. [See Section III for these procedures.]

The institution's academic vice chancellor is responsible for ensuring that procedures are properly followed and that appropriate documentation and appropriate signatures regarding allocation and reallocation of personnel or resources is provided. UW System Administration is particularly interested in the impact of the program request on academic support programs (including library and academic computing resources); supplies and expenses budgets; substantial equipment, building, or remodeling requests; and the provision for appropriate academic advising. Each new program request must include substantial reference to institutional planning and priorities for academic programs. [See Section III, New Program Planning and Approval, for further discussion.]

### Reporting the Results of Institutional Program Review

Each institution must report annually on the results of academic program review to UW System Administration. Reports must include a statement of the criteria used in the review and a description of the process to ensure implementation of results. The vice chancellor will determine which review recommendations to implement and will monitor implementation.

UW System Administration will evaluate these reports to ensure compliance with board policies and, at the board's request, will report on results of institutional review efforts. Evaluation may be completed through written reports or by visits to the institutions. UW System Administration will also work with the institutions to schedule mandated presentations on institutional general education programs.

## Appendix

**The following examples may serve as guidelines for the type of information that may be included in preliminary planning, program development and joint review.**

## A. Preliminary Entitlement to Plan a Proposal for a New Academic Program

I. PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION

1.1 **Title of Proposed Program:**

1.2 **Department or Functional Equivalent Sponsoring the Program:**

1.3 **College, School, or Functional Equivalent:**

1.4 **Timetable for Initiation:**

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

III. RATIONALE: State clearly and briefly why the state of Wisconsin and UW System need this program and why it cannot be offered within existing program authorizations or through cooperative programming.

IV. CONTEXT

4.1 **History of Program**: Provide a brief chronological record of any related program(s) from which the proposed program is developed, (e.g., submajor currently available under existing degree).

4.2 **Instructional Setting of Program**: Department, College, etc., intra- and inter-institutional. Describe the relationship of the proposed program to present programs. If appropriate, describe interdepartmental or intercollegiate structures.

4.3 **Relation to Mission Statement and Institutional Academic Planning**: Describe how the proposed program relates to the mission and long-range academic plan of the institution and/or college. Reference academic planning documents currently on file with UW System Administration's Office of Academic Affairs or submit updated documents as an appendix.

4.4 **Institutional Enrollment Management**: Discuss this program's effects on institutional enrollment management targets. Also discuss any plans for program-specific enrollment caps.

4.5 **Comparable Programs Elsewhere in Wisconsin**: List programs elsewhere in the state that have similar titles or offer similar instruction and the institutions (public or private) which offer them. Comment on the major distinctions between the proposed program and others.

4.6 **Comparable Programs Outside Wisconsin (as applicable):** To what extent are similar programs outside Wisconsin available to Wisconsin residents? Special emphasis should be placed on opportunities available under the reciprocity agreement with Minnesota institutions.

V. SPECIAL COMMENTS

## B. Proposal for Authorization to Implement a New Academic Program

### I. PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION

**1.1 Title of Proposed Program:**
**1.2 Department or Functional Equivalent:**
**1.3 College, School, or Functional Equivalent:**
**1.4 Timetable for Initiation:**

### II. CONTEXT

2.1 **History of Program:** Provide a brief chronological record of any predecessor program(s) from which the proposed program is developed (e.g., submajor currently available under existing degree).

2.2 **Instructional Setting of Program:** Describe the relationship of the proposed program to existing academic programs. If appropriate, describe interdepartmental or intercollegiate structures.

2.3 **Relation to Mission Statement and Academic Plan:** Describe how the proposed program relates to the mission and academic plan of the institution. Reference "Institutional Statement of New Academic Priorities" on file with the Office of Academic Affairs or submit up-dated document as an appendix.

### III. NEED

3.1 **Comparable Programs Elsewhere in Wisconsin:** List programs elsewhere in the state that have a similar title or offer similar instruction and their institutions (public or private). Explain major distinctions between the proposed program and others.

3.2 **Cooperative or Alternative Program Exploration:** To what extent have you explored the possibility of offering the proposed or an approximately equivalent program cooperatively with another institution, or as a submajor in conjunction with some existing program? Discuss past or future plans to provide this program regionally through interinstitutional consortia.

3.3 **Comparable Program Outside Wisconsin:** To what extent are similar programs in neighboring states available to Wisconsin residents? Compare these programs to the proposed program. (Special emphasis should be placed on opportunities available under the reciprocity agreement with Minnesota institutions.)

3.4 **Institutional Service Area, Statewide and National Need:** Discuss, with reference to the programs listed above, the total annual graduates of all existing programs and estimated future employment opportunities. Where appropriate, provide documentation by citing data from organizations such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics and/or professional associations.

3.5 **Special Interests in the Proposed Program:** Describe any special need for this program expressed by state agencies, industry, research centers, or other educational institutions. Provide documentation, including citations of relevant state regulations or employer policy.

3.6 **Student Demand--Future Enrollment:** In the context of the above information, provide a needs analysis documented by quantitative data. Include projections for anticipated enrollment and number of degrees to be granted for each of the first five years. Also discuss the program in terms of institutional enrollment management targets and/or any anticipated program-specific limitations on future enrollment.

IV. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION

4.1 **OBJECTIVES:** Provide a brief narrative description of the program. List the central academic objectives of the program to be used in evaluating its future success.

4.2 **METHOD OF ASSESSMENT OR EVALUATION:** Outline a general plan for the eventual assessment of program success, including assessment of student learning and each of the objectives listed above. Include plans for quantitative or qualitative indicators. Indicate who will conduct the evaluation and the regularity with which it will occur. Provide information on how the relative strengths of the proposed program could be measured and compared to similar programs at other institutions.

4.3 **CURRICULUM:** Discuss the proposed sequence of courses or provide a course matrix for the program, marking with an asterisk any new courses proposed. Note prerequisite and required courses within and outside the sponsoring department. Describe program entrance requirements, (e.g. completion of a number of credits, minimum GPA or GRE score). Also describe all degree completion requirements (e.g. portfolio, theses, oral exams, foreign language proficiency, capstone seminar, senior project internship). For graduate programs, the discussion should discuss the mix of graduate-only and undergraduate/graduate courses. Describe the proposed curriculum in terms of credits-to-degree and reasonable timelines for degree completion.

4.4 **INTERRELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER CURRICULA:** Briefly describe how the new program will support and/or be supported by other institutional programs. Discuss any relationships with the general education program.

4.5 **STRENGTHS OR UNIQUE FEATURES:** Describe any special strengths or unique features offered by the proposed program.

4.6 **OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENT INVOLVEMENT:** Describe the degree and nature of opportunities for co-curricular experiences or any exceptional opportunities for appropriate student-faculty contact.

4.7 **CAREER PREPARATION:** Describe the career advisory services directly related and available to students in the program.

4.8 **OUTREACH (IF APPLICABLE):** Outline credit and noncredit outreach functions, including public service, provided by this academic program. Append UW-Extension review, if appropriate.

4.9 **ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENT:** If applicable, describe rationale for applying (or for not applying) for accreditation. Is program-specific accreditation available for the proposed program? If yes, contrast the impact on curriculum, total program costs and job opportunities for graduates of having an accredited versus a non-accredited program.

V. PERSONNEL

5.1 **FACULTY PARTICIPATING DIRECTLY IN THE PROGRAM:** List present faculty members who will directly participate in the proposed program as instructors and/or student advisors and append a curriculum vitae for each of these faculty members.

5.2 **ADVISORY FACULTY:** List faculty members (other than those listed for 5.1) who will be involved in the program in a related or advisory capacity. Particularly for faculty members in other departments or colleges, outline the history and extent of their involvement and discuss plans for continued involvement.

5.3 **ADDITIONAL FACULTY REQUIREMENTS:** Indicate the number (with rank, estimated salary range and estimated starting salary, and particular areas of specialization) of new faculty members (FTE) required to initiate the program and project long-range new faculty needs (with tentative timetable). Will new positions be required or can they be reallocated? Indicate the source for reallocation.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5.4 **ACADEMIC STAFF**: List current instructional and noninstructional academic staff members who would be assigned to the proposed program. List anticipated additions to the academic staff by position title. How will these needs be accommodated? Indicate the source for any reallocation of FTE. Estimate the salary ranges and starting salaries for any new hires.

5.5 **CLASSIFIED STAFF:** Provide information requested in 5.4 for classified staff. Indicate the source for any reallocation of FTE. Estimate the salaries for any necessary new hires.

VI. ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES

6.1 **LIBRARY RESOURCES**: Describe and evaluate current library resources necessary for the proposed program, particularly in comparison to other institutions now offering similar programs. Indicate additional library resources needed, the estimated cost, and the source for resources.

6.2 **ADDITIONAL SUPPORT RESOURCES**: Describe and evaluate special resources (computers, unique laboratories, audio-visual and other equipment, access to data bases, etc.) currently available to the proposed program. Indicate how additional special resources needed, if any, will be provided.

VII. FACILITIES - EQUIPMENT

7.1 **CAPITAL BUDGET NEEDS--EXISTING FACILITIES AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT**: List and evaluate facilities and capital equipment currently available to the proposed program.

7.2 **CAPITAL BUDGET NEEDS--ADDITIONAL FACILITIES REQUIRED**: List and describe facilities (special classrooms, laboratories, additional space, minor construction) needed to begin or sustain the proposed program. Provide an estimate of costs. Discuss impact upon the program if these resources are not provided through new state appropriations. Discuss expectations for extramural funding. If applicable, discuss plans for waste management and disposal.

7.3 **CLINICAL FACILITIES**: For health science programs or programs making clinical placements, describe the laboratories and/or agencies to be used for clinical instruction. Append supporting statements indicating that these facilities will be available.

VIII. FINANCE

8.1 **OPERATING BUDGET REQUIREMENTS**: Describe funding requirements and, using the attached chart, show the total budgetary allocation required to implement this program and to fund it for the first two biennia. Include a narrative statement fully explaining program costs and resources, appended to the budget sheet. Footnotes to the budget sheet or the narrative should separately identify one-time costs and on-going costs. If additional state appropriations are to be requested, explain contingency plans (phase-in of the program; delay in starting the program until internal or state funds could be found; delay until external fund-raising is successful). Discuss cost-per-credit and cost-per-degree.

8.2 **OPERATING BUDGET--S&E REQUIREMENTS**: With reference to the Board of Regents' Recommendations of the S&E Task Force, describe supplies and expense needs for the requested program. Include information on funding sources (reallocation, private funding). Explain this plan in the context of the institutional S&E plan. If applicable, discuss plans for waste management and disposal.

8.3 **OPERATING BUDGET REALLOCATION**: Most, if not all, of the funding requirements outlined above will be met by reallocation of base resources. Indicate the source and the amounts of reallocations. Append documented evidence of consultation with appropriate administrators. If considerable reallocation is from another academic program or academic support program, briefly explain the impact on that program (elimination of an existing major or conversion to a minor; resources freed up without adverse student consequences due to enrollment reductions)

8.4 **STUDENT FINANCIAL AIDS**: List any special student aids (scholarships, loans, employment opportunities) available to students in the proposed program. Include sources of the aids, estimated amounts, and documentation of availability.

8.5 **EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH SUPPORT**: Indicate sources and amounts of extramural funding support expected to be available for research related to the proposed program. Provide documentation supporting the basis of this expectation.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL

Date: _____
Unit: _____
Program: _____
Degree: _____

| | FIRST YEAR | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | AMOUNT | #FTE | AMOUN |
| FACULTY | | | |
| INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF | | | |
| NON-INSTRUCT ACADEMIC STAFF | | | |
| GRADUATE ASSISTANTS | | | |
| SUPPORT PERSONNEL | | | |
| Subtotal- | | | |

| | Amount | |
|---|---|---|
| SUPPLIES AND EXPENSES---------- | | |
| CAPITAL EQUIPMENT---------- | | |
| LIBRARY RESOURCES---------- | | |
| SPECIAL INFOR. RESOURCES---------- | | |
| COMPUTING RESOURCES---------- | | |
| OTHER EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT (DEFINE) ---- | | |
| Subtotal---------- | | |
| Grand Total---------- | | |

| Amount and Percentage of Total Anticipated From: | Amount | % | FTE | Amount |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NEW AND STATE APPROPRIATION | | | | |
| REALLOCATION---------- | | | | |
| GIFTS & GRANTS---------- | | | | |
| Total---------- | | | | |

COSTS* FOR PROPOSED PROGRAM

Expected annual nos. of students: _____
Graduate (FTE) _____
Undergraduate (FTE) _____
Cost per Student $_____

| SECOND YEAR | | TOTAL FIRST BIENNIUM | | TOTAL SECOND BIENNIUM | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T | # FTE | AMOUNT | # FTE | AMOUNT | # FTE |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Amount | Amount | Amount |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| % | FTE | Amount | % | FTE | Amount | % | FTE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 10 0 | | | 100 | | | 100 | |

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED TOTAL COS

Date: _____
Unit: _____
Program: _____
Degree: _____

| | FIRST YEAR | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | AMOUNT | #FTE | AMOUN |
| FACULTY | | | |
| INSTRUCTIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF | | | |
| NON-INSTRUCT ACADEMIC STAFF | | | |
| GRADUATE ASSISTANTS - | | | |
| | | | |
| SUPPORT PERSONNEL | | | |
| Subtotal- | | | |

| | Amount | |
|---|---|---|
| SUPPLIES AND EXPENSES---------- | | |
| CAPITAL EQUIPMENT---------- | | |
| LIBRARY RESOURCES---------- | | |
| SPECIAL INFOR. RESOURCES---------- | | |
| COMPUTING RESOURCES---------- | | |
| OTHER EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT (DEFINE) ---- | | |
| Subtotal---------- | | |
| Grand Total---------- | | |

| Amount and Percentage of Total Anticipated From: | Amount | % | FTE | Amount |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NEW AND STATE APPROPRIATION | | | | |
| REALLOCATION---------- | | | | |
| GIFTS & GRANTS---------- | | | | |
| Total---------- | | | | |





BEST CO

STS* FOR PROPOSED PROGRAM

Expected annual nos. of students: _____
Graduate (FTE) _____
Undergraduate (FTE) _____
Cost per Student $_____

| SECOND YEAR | | TOTAL FIRST BIENNIUM | | TOTAL SECOND BIENNIUM | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T | # FTE | AMOUNT | # FTE | AMOUNT | # FTE |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Amount | Amount | Amount |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| % | FTE | Amount | % | FTE | Amount | % | FTE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 10<br>0 | | | 100 | | | 100 | |



OPY AVAILABLE

**C. Letter of Transmittal Requesting Authorization to Implement a New Academic Program**

I. **INFORMATION**

A. Exact Program Designation:

B. Department:

C. College:

D. Institution:

E. Degree Title:

G. Funding Source: New GPR _____ Extramural _____

Base Reallocation _____ Redeployment _____

II. **UNIT APPROVALS** APPROVAL DATE

A. Department Head/Functional Equivalent _____ _____

B. Dean of College _____ _____

C. Dean of Graduate School** _____ _____

D. Chair, Academic Planning Council or equivalent _____ _____

E. Chair, Faculty Senate _____ _____

F. Vice Chancellor _____ _____

G. Chancellor _____ _____

**Only for Graduate Programs

### D. Joint Review for Final Approval of a Newly Implemented Academic Program

The purposes of the joint review for final approval by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs are to:

- Determine whether the goals and objectives originally stated in the program proposal were met. If not, why not?
- Ascertain how the program is related to other programs offered by the institution and what priority ranking is assigned to it.
- Assess the level of quality the program has attained since its initiation.
- Indicate whether a cost effective, quality program can be further developed and sustained within the constraints on the resources of the institution.

The following outline defines the roles and responsibilities of UW System Administration and the institution. It also specifies the sequence of action from the initial scheduling of the review through the reporting of outcomes to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

1. System Administration will provide a list of questions specific to each program to cover aspects of system concern and based on the program's original Authorization to Implement (Format B). This will be provided near the end of the fifth year so that the review can be initiated early in the sixth year.

2. Besides System Administration questions, the UW institution will incorporate into its review format additional college-, department-, and field-specific items appropriate for the program to be reviewed. Any changes in or additions to the review format will be communicated to System Administration and the final format will be included in the review documentation that is forwarded to System Administration.

3. If necessary, System Administration representatives will meet with representatives of the vice chancellor's office prior to beginning the review to discuss questions of format and procedure.
4. The internal review process will be conducted by the institution in two stages. The first stage will be a self-study usually undertaken by the department(s) and faculty specifically concerned with the implementation of the program. The second stage of the review will be carried out a Joint Review Committee consisting of the original Program Review committee, or replacements appointed by the appropriate appointing officers. **Review by external evaluators is required for all programs**.

5. After the internal review process has been completed, the self-study report and all related documents, **including external evaluations**, will be forwarded to the institution's academic vice chancellor. The vice chancellor will then forward a copy of the internal reports and all accompanying documents to the UW System Office of Academic Affairs.

6. The Senior VP for Academic Affairs will review the materials and act on the program.

7. After receiving final approval from the Senior VP for Academic Affairs, a program enters the normal institutional review cycle. This joint review for final board approval has applied to all new programs approved since January 1, 1976.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## E. Joint Review Format For a Newly Implemented Academic Program

This format may be used by the vice chancellor. Documents are usually prepared by the department chair or director in charge of a newly implemented academic program), in consultation with the dean and/or vice chancellor. The information will be used by external consultants and the joint review committee, which includes representatives of the UW System Administration, in evaluating a new academic program after approximately five years of implementation.

1. Program Description and Context

   1.1 Provide a statement of the objectives and goals of the program and describe any changes that have occurred since the program was implemented. In an appendix, attach copies of any printed program information such as catalogue text, brochures, and other pertinent information describing the program. Provide details on assessment or evaluation of the program's success in meeting its goals and objectives.

   1.2 Describe the context for the program, including its relationship to the University's mission and its long-range plans, and to other academic programs within the UW System. Also compare it to similar types of programs in the region and nation.

   1.3 Discuss what needs are being met by this program and whether these needs could be met by other programs in the UW System. Discuss what effects, if any, this program may have had on the enrollments in (undergraduate or graduate) programs in related disciplines or any other related programs.

2. Faculty and Staff

   2.1 Discuss any changes in the faculty participating directly in the core and elective courses. Indicate to what extent new faculty have been recruited. Append short vitae for the core faculty members along with a list of names and departments of other faculty associated with the program.

3. Students (Past, present and future)

   3.1 Please review, verify, and analyze the trends represented by the data given in the appendix pertaining to degree program enrollment and degree recipients reported to the UW System Central Data Request (CDR) during the past five years.

   3.2 Provide a profile of degree recipients and degree program students highlighting characteristics such as the areas of application and the post-baccalaureate employment or graduate training of degree recipients.

   3.3 Discuss the potential for future enrollment in the program as related to past enrollment and existing resources. In addition, provide a chart showing projected enrollments and graduates.

4. Curriculum

   4.1 Provide any changes in the initial list of foundation and core courses for the program, and a sample sequence of courses taken by the majority of students in the program. (Include additional sequences if there are multiple areas of specialization or application within the program.)

   4.2 Describe the current administrative structure for the program including the relationship between program faculty and their areas of concentration within the program. Also describe the relationship and interaction among the program faculty who are from different departments and different schools.

5. Academic Support Services

   5.1 Describe the physical facilities, capital equipment, library resources and supplies that sustain the program.

   5.2 Discuss any special programs, faculty, or outreach activities designed to enhance the program.

6. EXTERNAL EVALUATION AND/OR ACCREDITATION

6.1 Using specific indicators, provide a narrative summary and assessment of the quality of the program. Compare this program with similar programs at other institutions. Describe any problems that the program has faced/is facing and provide recommendations for resolving them.

6.2 Provide copies of assessments of the program and its graduates, including conclusions and recommendations that have been prepared by professional groups, employers, and external reviewers.

6.3 If specialized accreditation is available for this program, discuss the rationale of applying [or not applying], the impact of accreditation standards upon the curriculum, and the impact of accreditation standards on the total program costs.

7. FINANCE

7.1 Show program cost-per-credit and per-degree. Provide comparisons with similar programs.
7.2 Discuss whether the current operating budget is adequate to assure program quality. If additional support is needed to sustain program quality, indicate the areas affected and the amount and source of future funding for these areas.

7.3 Discuss any capital budget expenditures necessary to sustain the program and provide an estimate of costs.

8. SUMMARY

8.1 Summarize the program's overall effectiveness with respect to the original expectations. Indicate any observed obstacles to the fulfillment of the original objectives and the measures taken to overcome those obstacles. Describe any unanticipated contributions of the program to the teaching, research, or outreach mission of other departments at your institution or the university as a whole.

8.2 Recommend action for continuation with the final review process for this program, for revision of the program and later final review, or for discontinuance of the program.

## F. Establishment or Substantial Modification of a Submajor or Certification Program

I. Exact Description of Request: If certification, specify DPI or WTCS involvement.

II. Title of Program:

III. Relationship to Mission of Institution: Brief description of how this program relates to the institutional mission.

IV. List of Courses: Identify required and elective courses. Indicate new courses by an asterisk.

V. Cost Implications: Describe in appropriate detail the cost of faculty and staff, capital equipment, and supplies and expenses associated with the program. Identify sources for planned allocations and/or reallocations.

VI. Rationale: Reasons for establishing a new submajor or certification program or for modifying an existing one.

## G. Institutional Report on General Education Programs

This format is furnished by the UW System Office of Academic Affairs to aid the institutions in preparing a presentation to the Board of Regents on general education. It is intended to suggest minimum information and areas of board interest. Institutions are encouraged to add information in order to present a comprehensive description of the total general education program. For example, the institution could include descriptions of opportunities provided to students through out-of-class activities, or details representing unique features of the institution's intellectual and cultural atmosphere.

In consultation with the UW System Office of Academic Affairs, the institution should prepare a short text (three-to-seven pages, plus appendices) and the outline for a short presentation (fifteen minutes) by a faculty member, the vice chancellor or relevant dean, and a representative student. The presentation will be made to the Education Committee of the Board of Regents. The Committee will ask questions following the presentation.

### I. General Education and the Institution: Process

1. Describe the process of designing and reviewing general education requirements, including information such as the membership of those committees, the types of discussions, and estimates of the time involved. Provide a brief chronological overview of recent changes and/or describe any overall restructuring of the general education program over the past five years, by way of illustrating the process.

2. If applicable, also discuss the process by which any college-level differences in general education are accommodated.

### II. General Education and the Institution: Philosophy

1. Describe the institutional philosophy of general education, including specific goals for the general education curriculum. For example, discuss the institutional philosophy concerning both acquisition of proficiency skills and acquisition of substantive knowledge ("content") in the general education program. Attach the institutional statement of this philosophy (from the catalogue or other official institutional publication).

2. If applicable, also discuss any college-level differences in the philosophy of general education and the rationale for those differences. Attach relevant published statements (from the catalogue or other official institutional publication).

3. If different from #1 (above), include a description of the process by which the philosophy and goals are adopted and reviewed.

### III. General Education and the Institution: Description of the Program and Evaluation of Results

#### A. Description

1. Provide an overview of the current general education program. Provide a description of proficiency requirements and a description of distribution requirements, along with lists of possible course choices. If relevant, include requirements and lists of possible courses in interdisciplinary studies, such as writing across the curriculum, senior capstone experience, freshman seminar, international education, or multi-cultural perspectives. Attach catalogue statements and timetable information.

2. If colleges, schools and/or academic programs differ over choices for distribution requirements, provide descriptions of requirements and lists of course choices. Attach relevant catalogue and timetable statements.

3. Describe sequencing of general education credits and desired patterns of course completion for students. Compare it to available data about actual course-completion patterns.

**B. Evaluation**

1. Describe how the general education curriculum provides students with opportunities to achieve institutional goals (as stated in the philosophy attached for Section II). Describe links between coursework and students' acquisition of targeted skills and knowledge.

2. Discuss any current or planned use of assessment processes (such as student, alumni, or employer surveys) in review and improvement of the general education program

**CENTERS OR INSTITUTES**[2]. The establishment, renaming or elimination of centers and institutes must be filed with System Administration as an information item.

**CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS**[2]. The creation of new certification programs and the renewal of existing certification programs on the occasion of periodic review by the Department of Public Instruction or professional associations must be filed with System Administration as an information item.

**DEGREE PROGRAM EXTENDED TO A SECOND INSTITUTION/COOPERATIVE PROGRAMMING**[2]. An institution authorized to grant a bachelor's, master's, or education specialist degree may, through cooperative programming with another institution(s), enable students registered at the second institution to complete the requirements for the degree and to have the degree conferred by the institution authorized to grant it. As part of the responsibility of System Administration to maintain overview of majors offered in the UW System, any agreement to extend a degree authorization to serve students at another institution requires review and approval by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. The institution having the program entitlement is responsible for seeking UW System approval. Interinstitutional agreements to extend degree programming to a second institution are subject to review and evaluation as may be requested by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

**DEGREES**[2]. An academic degree is the associate, baccalaureate, master's, specialist, or doctoral degree awarded to an individual who completes all degree requirements specified by the institution through the appropriate school, college, or university faculty. Since adding to the list of degrees authorized for an institution requires board action, the establishment of any new degree programs will require board approval. However, existing degree authorizations may be modified with the approval of System Administration.

**DEPARTMENTS**[2]. It is important that System Administration be informed of proposed and effected changes in the array of departments within an institution.

**INSTITUTIONAL MISSION**[2]. For each institution there is a select or special mission which outlines the broad but fundamental purposes of the institution. The board has the responsibility for approving and promulgating the set of mission statements for the University of Wisconsin System. This is, perhaps, the most important board function performed in all of public higher education in Wisconsin for it gives basic form to the academic programs of the UW System. The statute creating the University of Wisconsin System requires that there be public hearings prior to the boards' modification of the missions statement of any institution. Modifications of any mission statement require regent approval.

**INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM AUDIT**[1]. One of the means of identifying from the total spectrum of programs those which should receive thorough review by the faculty and institutions in a particular period of time. An audit is the examination of the condition of each academic program in terms of a limited number of readily quantifiable indicators. An audit <u>does not</u> create a presumption that the programs selected for intensive analysis are in fact in trouble or headed for trouble. The indicators used for audit purposes may suggest this, but more intensive analysis may lead to a quite different judgment.

**INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW**[1]. A comprehensive and intensive reexamination of a particular academic program. Program review is a judgmental process which uses audit information as available and additional relevant information or analysis, to reach a judgment as to what changes, if any, should be taken relative to the program receiving review. The review rather than the audit, would lead to recommendations that a program be changed in form and direction, reviewed again at a later time, continued, phased out, consolidated with other programs, or augmented.

**MAJORS**[2]. A program of study leading to a "major" is one which consists of a specific number of required and elective course credits and/or the successful completion of specified competency requirements and which culminates in an authorized degree. New majors must be approved by the Board of Regents. Faculty responsibility for majors is generally exercised through departments or their functional equivalent. System Administration maintains an overview of the majors offered in the UW System. Thus any redirection or renaming of authorized majors requires approval by System Administration. Decisions to eliminate a major must be filed with System Administration as an information item. The conversion of an existing major into an extended degree must follow the academic program development procedures set forth in this guideline.

**SUBMAJORS**[2]. Because submajors frequently expand to become majors and thus affect missions and resource use, the creation of new submajors as well as the renaming or elimination of existing submajors must be filed with System Administration.

**SYSTEM LATERAL PROGRAM REVIEW**[1]. A procedure for an intensive and comprehensive examination of like programs in several institutions where the possibility of excessive program replication, or excessive or insufficient program capacity, or quality exists, or where such problems might result from new program

development. Lateral program reviews can be accomplished by System staff, interinstitutional faculty task forces, external disciplinary specialists, or combinations of these, in consultation with affected faculties.

**SCHOOLS, COLLEGES OR DIVISIONS**[2]. The UW System universities are organized into schools, colleges, or divisions which are coherent assemblages of faculty and programs headed by a dean or director. Inasmuch as the array of schools, colleges or division at any institution is derived from the select or special mission of that institution, it is necessary that the formation or merger of schools, colleges, or divisions be approved by System Administration and the board. (Note: Section 36.09(1)(gm) of the merger statutes requires legislative approval for the creation of a school or college which is to have graduate or professional, post-baccalaureate academic programs.)

[1] From ACIS-4, January 1977, Summary of UWS Academic Program Audit and Review
[2] From ACIS 1, August 1984, Academic Program Guidelines